

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 are pending. The Final Action dated July 5, 2007 in this Application has been carefully considered. The following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been amended in this Response. Claims 7-14 have been cancelled without prejudice in this Response. Applicants reserve the right to resubmit the canceled Claims and assert that the subject matter has not been dedicated to the public. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of following remarks.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview conducted on August 22, 2007. During the interview, the rejections and cited art were discussed. Tentative agreement was not reached that the Claims are patentable. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues raised or remaining.

Claims 1-3 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,970,924 to Chu et al. ("Chu"). Insofar as the reference may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 1 has been amended for clarity and now recites:

appending, by the UE, the derived serving network domain name information to an application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name; performing, by the UE, a domain name query as a function of the domain-specific application server name; and receiving, by the UE, a second IP address as a function of the domain-specific application server name.

(Emphasis added.) No new matter has been added by these amendments. Support for these amendments can be found, among other places, in original Claims 15 and 20, and paragraph [0020] of the original Application, as referenced in the published Application.

Chu was cited as assertedly fully disclosing all the limitations of Claim 1. However, Chu does not suggest, teach, or disclose, at least, appending a derived serving network domain name information to an application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name, and performing a domain name query as a function of the domain-specific application server name. Instead, Chu teaches performing a reverse lookup of IP addresses that are identified by tracing packet paths. See Chu, col. 15, lines 32-35 along with col. 16, lines 10-13.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited reference does not suggest, teach, or disclose the unique combination recited in Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these dependent Claims should also be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of dependent Claims 2 and 3 also be withdrawn and that Claims 2 and 3 be allowed.

Applicants contend that the rejection of Claim 20 is traversed for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 is traversed. These reasons include Chu not disclosing, teaching, or suggesting appending derived domain name information to an application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name, and performing a domain name query as a function of the domain-specific application server name. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 20 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited

reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and that Claim 20 be allowed.

Claims 4-6 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Chu in view of Official Notice. Insofar as the reference and Official Notice may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6 depend from and further limit Claim 1. As established above, Chu does not suggest, teach, or disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Official Notice is not relied upon to supply the missing limitations. Hence, these dependent Claims should also be deemed to be in condition for allowance, for at least their dependence from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of dependent Claims 4-6 also be withdrawn and that Claims 4-6 be allowed.

Applicants contend that the rejection of Claim 15 is traversed for at least some of the reasons that the rejection of Claim 1 is traversed. These reasons include Chu not disclosing, teaching, or suggesting appending derived domain name information to an application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name, and performing a domain name query as a function of the domain-specific application server name. Official Notice is not relied upon to supply these missing limitations. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 15 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in proffered combination with Official Notice. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and that Claim 15 be allowed.

Claims 16-19 depend from and further limit Claim 15. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these dependent Claims should also be deemed to be in condition for

allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of dependent Claims 16-19 also be withdrawn and that Claims 16-19 be allowed.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of Claims 1-6 and 15-20.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this Application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: September 4, 2007
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093